

Public Document Pack

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Town Hall, Main Road, Romford
20 March 2012 (7.30 - 11.25 pm)
and 29 March 2012 (7.30 - 9.00 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS

Conservative Group	Billy Taylor (Chairman), Frederick Thompson (Vice-Chair), Steven Kelly, Lynden Thorpe and Damian White (20 March only) and Jeff Brace (on 29 March only)
Residents' Group	John Wood and Ron Ower (on 20 March only) and Clarence Barrett (on 29 March only)
Labour Group	Denis Breading
Independent Residents Group	David Durant

Apologies for absence noted for Councillor Brian Eagling.

+Substitute Member: Councillors Ron Ower for Brian Eagling (on 20 March) and Clarence Barrett (on 29 March only) for Brian Eagling, and Jeff Brace for Damian White (on 29 March only).

Speaking in relation to Item 79 Councillor Thompson informed the Committee that he was on the board of Governors of Broadford Primary School.

On 20 March:

Councillors Clarence Barrett, Dennis Bull, Gillian Ford, Linda Hawthorn, Barbara Matthews and Keith Wells were also present for parts of the meeting.

There were about 40 members of the public present at the meeting.

On 29 March:

Councillors Gillian Ford, Linda Hawthorn and Wendy Brice-Thompson were also present for parts of the meeting.

There were about 30 members of the public present at the meeting.

All decisions were taken unanimously, except where shown otherwise.

The Chairman reminded Members of the action to be taken in an emergency.

At the conclusion of the meeting on 20 March, the Committee adjourned until 29 March to consider the matter referred to in minutes 84 and 86 following.

76 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 21 February 2012 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

77 SUSTRANS CONNECT 2 - PHASES 2 & 3 HIGHWAY WORKS (PAGES WOOD TO RAINHAM VILLAGE)

Following the meeting of the Committee on 21 February 2012 where Members deferred the item for further consultation with officers.

The report before the Committee sought recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that the highway improvement works between Pages Wood (Harold Wood) and Rainham Village be approved for implementation.

The scheme was supported with £880,000 of Big Lottery grant funding provided through Sustrans and additional Council capital funding, grants via the Transport for London Local Implementation Plan and Veolia Havering Riverside Trust.

The scheme's overarching aim was to improve local travel in 79 communities around the UK by creating new walking and cycling networks for everyday journeys.

By means of bridges, tunnels and other crossings, barriers such as busy roads, rivers and railways can be overcome to make travelling on foot or bike easier and more direct. With each new crossing linking to a local network of walking and cycling routes, there would be direct access to local schools, shops and workplaces, as well as green spaces.

In terms of design, the route was being designed for pedestrians, both the experienced and inexperienced cyclist, and equestrian riders where possible.

Sustrans and the Council were promoting a scheme for the Ingrebourne Valley which would build on, connect to and improve existing routes, some of which had been in place for some time.

The 13 mile route, called the "Ingrebourne Way" would form the new National Cycle Route No.136, starting in Noak Hill and ending at

Rainham Marshes, running through Harold Hill, Harold Wood, Harold Park, Cranham, Upminster, Hornchurch, Elm Park and South Hornchurch.

The first phase of the scheme between Noak Hill and Pages Wood had been completed.

The current focus of activity was now Phases 2 & 3 which would complete the scheme between Pages Wood and Rainham Marshes by March 2013.

As well as any statutory consultation processes, the project was overseen by the Connect 2 Steering Group which sought to engage various stakeholders in the development of the route. The group included Council Staff, Sustrans, local walking and cycling groups, Forestry Commission, Environment Agency, biodiversity groups and others as required.

The route and design of the various features had also been reviewed by Sustrans both from a network planning and engineering point of view and fully acceptable to the organisation.

In accordance with the public participation arrangements the Committee was addressed by an objector who expressed his views and concern for parts of the scheme.

During the debate members raised general concerns over the design of the scheme including the safety of having mixed use, cycle and pedestrian, paths through Upminster Park. Members also queried the technical specification of the proposed advisory cycle lanes and raised concerns about the proposed 3 metres width of the lanes.

In reply to Member comments Officers informed the Committee that the proposed 3 metres shared use-cycle track was a safe proposal and in line with other sections of Phase 1 which had been in operation for some time.

The Committee was informed that the crossing on Station Road had been in mixed use operation by pedestrians and cyclists for around 18 months without any reported incidents between the two user groups.

The Committee was also informed that the loss of the advisory cycle lanes would be compensated by the provision of on-road logos and appropriate signage at detailed design stage.

The Committee was informed that it was safety critical, due to increased levels of congestion, to widen certain short sections of the route.

A Member raised concerns over the cycle route going through Upminster Park and suggested that it could be rerouted along St Mary's Lane and Bridge Avenue. Officers commented that as a leisure route, St Mary's Lane was not considered to be appropriate.

The Committee was also informed that any change resulting in the removal of the route from Upminster Park would not be approved by Sustrans and would likely affect funding.

A MOTION was moved to change the route of the cycle route so that it would be diverted out of Upminster Park.

The MOTION was seconded.

At the vote, the motion was **rejected** 6 votes to 3.

A MOTION was moved to recommend the scheme for implementation subject to the following amendments:

1. the advisory cycle lanes along Hall Lane and shown on drawings 10,11,12,13,14 and 15 be removed and replaced by logos and signage;
2. the design of the route across the Hall Lane / A127 Bridge be delegated to the Head of StreetCare in consultation with the Committee Chairman.

The MOTION was seconded.

The Committee **RESOLVED** to recommend the scheme to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment as amended.

78 **37 - 55 COLLIER ROW LANE PARKING, BUS STOP AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS - OUTCOME OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

Members noted that this item was a long standing matter and had wide support. The Committee considered the report and without debate, **RESOLVED** to recommend the implementation of the scheme to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment

79 **SCHOOL CROSSING PATROL IMPROVEMENTS - BROADFORD PRIMARY SCHOOL FARRINGDON AVENUE**

The report before the Committee recommended alterations to the zebra crossing facility and School Keep Clear markings outside Broadford Primary School following the completion of the recent public consultation.

Following a complaint raised by the school crossing patrol (SCP) that on several occasions vehicles had overtaken busses and parked cars; had failed to see the SCP standing on the zebra crossing resulting in the vehicle being required to brake sharply.

To assist the SCP it was proposed to:

- a. extend the zebra crossing zigzags by 4 markings on both sides,
- b. change the two existing school keep clear markings to operational Monday to Friday 8am to 5pm,
- c. remove a short length of single yellow line and its time plate (the time plate is not in accordance with Traffic Signs Regulations & General Directions) on the opposite side to the school (to be replaced by the extended zigzag markings).

The Committee considered the report and after a short debate **RESOLVED** to recommend the implementation of the scheme to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment by 8 votes in favour to 1 against.

80 **FRONT LANE/MOOR LANE PROPOSED PAY & DISPLAY AND WAITING RESTRICTIONS - COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED PROPOSALS**

Members noted that the views detailed in the report went back to 2010 and could not be considered current. The Committee considered the proposal and without debate, **RESOLVED** to reject the recommendations of the report.

81 **PROPOSED PARKING SCHEMES - COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED PROPOSALS**

Each scheme was presented to the Committee and voted on as a separate item

1. Frazer Close – Drawing No. FRC/01/0/

The Committee considered the report and without debate, **RESOLVED** to recommend the implementation of the scheme to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment.

2. Park Drive – Drawing No. T&TE16-OF-101

The Committee considered the report and without debate, **RESOLVED** to recommend implementation of the scheme to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment.

3. Wayside Close – Drawing No. TCP-16-of-101

In accordance with the public participation arrangements the Committee was addressed by a speaker.

The Committee considered the report and after a short debate **RESOLVED** to recommend implementation of the scheme to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment.

4. Wennington/Brady – Drawing No. QF210/501

The Committee considered the report and after a short debate **RESOLVED** to recommend implementation of the scheme to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment.

5. Walden Road/ Goodrington School – Drawing No. GO1

The Committee considered the report and after a short debate, a **motion** was moved to reject the scheme. The **motion** was seconded.

The Committee **RESOLVED** to reject the scheme.

6. Meadway/Heath Drive – Drawing No. QF210/501

Without debate, a **motion** was moved to reject the scheme. The **motion** was seconded.

The Committee **RESOLVED** to reject the scheme.

7. Kew Close – Drawing No. TPC98-OF-101

The Committee considered the report and without debate, **RESOLVED** to recommend implementation of the scheme to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment.

8. Como Street– Drawing No. QJ115-OF-101

Without debate, a **motion** was moved to reject the scheme. The **motion** was seconded.

The Committee **RESOLVED** to reject the scheme.

9. Springfield Gardens/Argyle Gardens – Drawing No.SFG/01/01

The Committee considered the report and without debate, **RESOLVED** to recommend implementation of the scheme to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment.

82 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES APPLICATIONS

The report presented Members with all new highway schemes requests in order for a decision to be made on whether the scheme should progress or not before resources were expended on detailed design and consultation.

The Committee would either make recommendations to the Head of StreetCare to progress the scheme or the Committee would reject the request.

The Committee considered and agreed in principle the schedule that detailed the applications received by the service en bloc.

The Committee's decisions were noted as follows against each request:

Item Ref	Scheme	Description	Decision
SECTION B - Highway scheme proposals			
H1	Dagnam Park Drive	Remove set of speed cushions which is creating vibrations which is causing concern for a disabled resident who is housebound. Resident also concerned that cushions are not reducing speeds anyway. Rejected by HAC in December 2011, but resubmitted with Chairman's agreement as resident was unable to attend December's meeting.	REJECTED 6-3
H2	Junction Road	Request for speed humps	REJECTED
H3	Eastern Road/ Mercury Gardens	Opening of Eastern Road at junction with Mercury Gardens to reduce traffic flow on Junction Road	REJECTED

83 TRAFFIC AND PARKING SCHEMES REQUESTS

The report before the Committee detailed all Minor Traffic and Parking Scheme application requests in order for a decision to be made on whether the scheme should progress or not before resources were expended on detailed design and consultation.

The Committee would either make recommendations to the Head of StreetCare to progress the scheme or the Committee would reject the request.

The Committee considered and agreed in principle the schedule that detailed the applications received by the service.

The Committee's decisions were noted as follows against each scheme:

Traffic & Parking Control - StreetCare

Minor Traffic & Parking Schemes Applications Schedule

Item Ref	Location	Description	Decision
SECTION A - Minor Traffic and Parking Scheme Requests			
TPC180	Petersfield Avenue shops, Harold Hill	Double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking near the refuges at Petersfield shops	AGREED 7-2
TPC198	Pembrey Way, Hornchurch	Request to introduce pavement parking bays to assist vehicle access to Pembrey Way	REJECTED
TPC199	Hall Lane, Upminster	Request for double yellow lines in the small lay-by in the Hall Lane service road (opposite No. 160). To prevent vehicles parking in the lay-by and for it to act as a passing place in this narrow road	REJECTED
TPC200	Briarleas Gardens, Cranham	Request for parking restrictions on one side of the road to assist vehicle access	REJECTED

Highways Advisory Committee, 20 March 2012

TPC201	Pettits Lane, Romford	Request from resident at No 125 for footway parking in Pettits Lane	REJECTED
TPC202	Lodge Lane, Nth Romford	Request for yellow lines one side of the road to (at least as far as Frinton Road) to facilitate free movement of traffic in particular buses.	REJECTED 8-1
TPC203	Ashton Road, Harold Hill	Request for double yellow lines in Ashton Road to prevent obstructive parking and enable delivery vehicles to access business premises	DEFERRED for Officers to provide further detail on the scheme and for consideration to be given to the inclusion of the proposals as part of a wider scheme.
TPC204	Elm Park Avenue/Broadway, Elm Park	Request to review options of "loading ban" outside Tesco to ease traffic flow	DEFERRED 8-1 for Officers and ward Councillors have an opportunity to meet with Tesco representatives and discuss options.
TPC205	Rom Crescent, Romford	Request for yellow line between 3 & 5 Rom Crescent to allow access down road when residents opposite park across own drives	REJECTED 8-0 (Councillor Ower was absent for the vote)
TPC206	Brentwood Road, Romford	Request for review of parking provision in Brentwood Road (near Drill roundabout) and surrounding area following opening of Tesco Express	REJECTED

Highways Advisory Committee, 20 March 2012

TPC207	Brentwood Road, Romford	Improved parking provision for Brentwood Road shops. Possible changes of the existing disc parking bays and voucher parking bays in Douglas Road, Craigdale Road, Kyme Road and Albert Road	AGREED 8-1
TPC208	Oxford Road, Harold Hill	Request for suitable measures to deal with the expected parking problems in Oxford Road as a consequence of the forthcoming building development in that road	DEFERRED for further information on parking levels in the road.
TPC209	Castle Close, Romford	Request for parking restrictions in turning area of cul-de-sac to deter obstructive parking.	AGREED 5-3 (Cllr White was absent for the vote)
TPC210	Limerick Gardens, Cranham	Request for yellow lines in turning area of cul-de-sac to deter obstructive parking	REJECTED 6-3
TPC211	Ashvale Gardens, Cranham	Request for 'At any time' restriction in turning head at end of the Gardens	REJECTED
TPC212	Little Gaynes Lane, Upminster	Double yellow lines for 15 metres on both sides at the Corbets Tey Road entrance to Little Gaynes Lane (to prevent parking safety hazards at the junction with Corbets Tey Road) Then continuation with single yellow lines on both sides of the Lane up to Little Gaynes Gardens, with parking prohibited between 7am and 6:30pm on the evens side of the Lane and between 7am and 8:30am on the unevens side.	AGREED 7-2

SECTION B - Minor Traffic and Parking Scheme Requests on hold for future discussion or funding issues			
TPC70	Mashiters Walk, Romford	Request for single yellow line restriction between 10am and 11am following increase in commuter parking as a result of the restrictions recently implemented in the Lake Rise/Rosemary Avenue Area	NOTED
TPC93	Engayne Gardens, Upminster	Request to remove or convert to residents' parking bays a free parking bay on the corner of Engayne and Ashburnham Gardens	NOTED
TPC120	Ruskin Avenue, Spenser Crescent, Masefield Drive and Hall Lane, Upminster	Request for junction protection at junction of Ruskin Avenue with Masefield Drive, Spenser Crescent with Masefield Drive, Spenser Crescent with Hall Lane and Masefield Drive with Hall Lane plus double yellow lines at the apex of bends in Masefield Drive to deter obstructive parking by users of Upminster Hall Playing Fields	NOTED
TPC130	Cheshire Close, Emerson Park	Request for footway parking bays	NOTED

Highways Advisory Committee, 20 March 2012

TPC136	29 Hill Grove, Romford	Request for restrictions in Hill Grove due to increased number of vehicles parked in the road following the implementation of restrictions in Cedric Avenue	NOTED
TPC149	Chase Cross Road, Collier Row	Request for restrictions near the junction with Havering Road to be implemented from the bus stand back to the zebra crossing	NOTED
TPC156	Introduction of Pay by Phone	To provide additional method of payment for residents and visitors to the borough in Romford Town Centre car parks and a number of free bays in Upminster and Gidea Park where commuter parking is prevalent and dual usage of voucher bays in Crow Lane	NOTED
TPC181	Mawney Road, Romford	Request to remove restrictions in Mawney Road in the area north of the A12	NOTED
TPC188	Hall Lane, Upminster	Request to extend the yellow line further north on the east side of Hall Lane, with restrictions applicable Sunday 9am to 1pm only, to assist with problem parking during football games	NOTED
TPC195	Firham Park Estate, Harold Wood	Request from resident and visitor to estate for parking restrictions to deter commuter parking and junction protection to deter inconsiderate parking on corners obscuring sight lines.	NOTED

84 **PROPOSAL TO INTRODUCE PARKING CHARGES IN TO PARK CAR PARKS - COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED PROPOSALS**

The Chairman moved a MOTION that the item be deferred, to be dealt with at a reconvened meeting, following the omission of consultees comments from the original report. An appendix of the additional comments was tabled at the meeting but it was felt that there was insufficient time for Members to give the additional information due consideration.

The MOTION was seconded.

The Committee **RESOLVED** to adjourn this report to enable Members to give full consideration to those comments and would consider at a reconvened meeting commencing at 7:30pm on 29 March 2012.

The vote was passed by 6 votes to 3.

85 **SUSPENSION OF COMMITTEE PROCEDURE RULES**

During the discussion of remaining items on the agenda the Committee **RESOLVED** to suspend Council Procedure Rule 9 to allow the conclusion of consideration of the remaining items on the agenda.

The vote for the proposal was passed by 8 votes to 1 against, Councillor Breading voted against the proposal.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank